



Syddansk Universitet

Opportunity structures for selective exposure

investigating selective exposure and learning in Swedish election campaigns using panel survey data

Skovsgaard, Morten ; Shehata, Adam; Strömbäck, Jesper

Published in:

The International Journal of Press/Politics

DOI:

[10.1177/1940161216658157](https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161216658157)

Publication date:

2016

Document version

Peer reviewed version

Document license

CC BY

Citation for pulished version (APA):

Skovsgaard, M., Shehata, A., & Strömbäck, J. (2016). Opportunity structures for selective exposure: investigating selective exposure and learning in Swedish election campaigns using panel survey data. The International Journal of Press/Politics, 21(4), 527-546. DOI: 10.1177/1940161216658157

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Opportunity Structures for Selective Exposure: Investigating Selective Exposure and Learning in Swedish Election Campaigns using Panel Survey Data

Morten Skovsgaard

skh@sam.sdu.dk

Centre for Journalism

University of Southern Denmark

Adam Shehata

Department of Journalism, Media and Communication

Gothenburg University

Jesper Strömbäck

Department of Journalism, Media and Communication

Gothenburg University

ABSTRACT:

The transition from low choice to high-choice media environments has raised new concerns about selective exposure. In this context, two types of selective media exposure are relevant. One is selectivity based on political ideological preferences and the other is selectivity based on political interest. Evidence for both has been found primarily in an American context, while there is less research on European countries. This is problematic, since the opportunity structures for different forms of selectivity vary across media environments. Against this background, the purpose of this study is to investigate the two types of selective exposure in a country – Sweden – where the opportunity structures for selective exposure differ from the American context. This study investigates both types of selective exposure in relation to televised party leader interviews in Sweden. Based on panel survey data, the findings show that selective exposure based on political interest is substantially more important than selective exposure based on ideological preferences in explaining exposure to party-leader interviews. To substantiate this finding the results are replicated with partisan learning as the dependent variable.

Keywords: Media Consumption, Selective Exposure, Media Environment, Polarization, Political Information

The transition from low choice to high-choice media environments has fundamentally reshaped contemporary political information environments and drastically expanded the supply of all kinds of information. As a consequence, media consumers have more opportunities than ever to select and to avoid media content according to their own personal interests and preferences (Bennett and Iyengar 2008). These rich opportunity structures, in turn, may increase the importance of people's motivations and abilities when deciding what media and media content they expose themselves to (Luskin 1990; Prior 2007).

One key motivation to select media content is rooted in people's ideological leanings. Several scholars have argued that when people can choose among a variety of sources, they tend to select content that supports their political attitudes and beliefs while avoiding opinion-challenging information (Bennett and Iyengar 2008; Mutz and Martin 2001).

Another key motivation is interest in politics (Prior 2007; Strömbäck and Shehata 2010). Not only has the proliferation of media made it more easy to find attitude-consistent or avoid attitude-discrepant information, it has also made it easier to find or avoid political information altogether. Political interest has thus become a more important predictor of news media use, and some studies suggest an increasing gap between news-seekers and news-avoiders in terms of their news media consumption (Ksiazek et al. 2010; Strömbäck et al. 2013).

Both kinds of motivated selectivity present potential challenges to democracy, either by an increased polarization of political views and a lack of common ground for democratic talk, or by widening knowledge gaps. From a democratic point of view, it can be argued that it is essential that people are exposed to political information and opposing perspectives and

viewpoints, as it tends to promote political tolerance, more careful information search, and political knowledge (Delli Carpini et al. 2004; Mutz 2006; Sunstein 2007; Stroud 2010, 2011).

Although the evidence for selective exposure is not entirely consistent (Mutz and Young 2011), American studies have provided compelling evidence for selective exposure based on both ideological preferences and political interest (Arceneaux and Johnson 2013; Iyengar and Hahn 2009; Prior 2007). Thus far there is however only limited research on selective exposure beyond the American context. This is problematic, not least since *the opportunity structures for selective exposure* vary across media environments. Thus, it cannot be assumed that evidence of selective exposure found in the US can be generalized to other countries, for example in Europe. This holds particularly true with respect to television, where in most European countries there are strong public service broadcasting, characterized by norms of impartiality and internal pluralism and no partisan channels equivalent to FOX News or MSNBC (Esser et al. 2012; Hallin and Mancini 2004).

Against this background and focusing on television, the purpose of this study is to investigate the presence of selective exposure based on ideological preferences and political interest in a country – Sweden – where the opportunity structures provide plenty of scope for selectivity based on political interest but a narrow scope for selectivity based on ideological preferences. More specifically, based on a panel study during the 2010 Swedish national election campaign we analyze both forms of selectivity using exposure to televised party-leader interviews as well as partisan learning as outcome variables. By doing this, we also seek to highlight the theoretical importance of *opportunity structures for selective exposure* for a full understanding of selective exposure in contemporary media environments. The main reason to focus on television

is that it remains one of the media sources where most people get their information about politics (Shehata and Strömbäck 2014).

Two types of selective exposure and the influence of media system characteristics

As noted above, the transformation from low- to high-choice media environments has prompted a concern for selective exposure to political information. In essence, growing media supply is said to increase the importance of personal motivations as predictors of what information people consume (Prior 2007). In *Changing Minds or Changing Channels*, Arceneaux and Johnson define motivation “broadly as any goal-directed preference regarding what to watch on television” (2013: 52). In other words, increasing media supply makes media consumers more likely to select content in line with their preferences (Bennett and Iyengar 2008; Iyengar and Hahn 2009; Mutz and Young 2011; Prior 2007).

In this context, there are basically two types of motivations that might lead to selective exposure. The first is rooted in people’s *political interest*. Increasing supply enables people with low interest in politics to consume media while avoiding political information, while people with stronger interest can consume even more political information. In the US, this gap in news media consumption between news-avoiders and news-seekers has been shown to increase the gap in political knowledge and turnout (Prior 2007). The other type of motivation is rooted in people’s *political or ideological preferences*. Here theory suggests that people prefer being exposed to arguments that are in line with their attitudes or beliefs, rather than to arguments running counter to them (Frey 1986; Lodge and Taber 2013). This leads to a tendency to select information or media sources which people expect will meet such demands (Knobloch-Westervick and Meng

2009; Mutz 2006; Stroud 2008). This argument implies an ideological gap in exposure to political information.

The growing interest in ideological selective exposure is largely driven by the US experience of increasing polarization in terms of both media and politics (Bennett and Iyengar 2008; Iyengar and Hahn 2009; Mutz and Young 2011; Stroud 2008; 2011). Apart from the fact that the Internet has introduced an almost infinite number of potential information sources for citizens in many Western democracies, a significant change in the American media environment is the political polarization of the broadcasting system, in particular with the introduction of FOX News and MSNBC. In the US, studies have also produced empirical evidence for ideological selective exposure for watching cable television (Iyengar and Hahn 2009; Pew 2010). Stroud (2011), for example, finds substantial ideological selectivity of specific content on television (Democratic and Republican presidential nomination acceptance speeches) as well as of politically biased news outlets (newspapers, radio and television networks).

While the debate on selective exposure is primarily based on the US experience, important to note is that the *opportunity structures* for selective exposure vary across countries. By *opportunity structures for selective exposure* we refer to the availability of different media, media formats, media genres and media content, and the ease with which citizens can select media and media content based on their personal preferences. In some media environments it is easier for citizens to find content that matches their preferences, for example in terms of ideological leaning, while it is more difficult in other media environments. This holds true both on an aggregate level as well as with respect to different media types such as newspapers, television and the Internet.

We believe the concept of opportunity structures for selective exposure is important, not least considering research indicating that media use is influenced by the media environment in which people live, alongside individual abilities and motivations (Aalberg et al. 2013; Althaus et al. 2009; Curran et al. 2009; Goldman and Mutz, 2011; Prior 2007; Shehata & Strömbäck 2011). Similar to other behaviors, media use is shaped by opportunities as well as preferences and abilities (Luskin 1990). Thereby, differences in opportunities for selective exposure across media environments should have an impact on the presence and ubiquity of selective exposure in countries with different media environments.

Although the growing popularity of the Internet and the multiplication of cable channels are more or less similar across media systems, the situation is quite different with respect to terrestrial broadcasting. Here, the strong position of public service broadcasting in many European countries has (thus far) prevented a political polarization of the broadcasting system that has emerged in the US. In many countries, public broadcasters hold substantial market shares. They are also obliged to work in accordance with norms of impartiality, objectivity and political neutrality (Hallin and Mancini 2004; Esser et al. 2012). Next to the public service stations, a number of international cable channels offer pure entertainment programming and provide people the chance to avoid news and political information altogether in favor of entertainment. Comparing media environments in the US and in European countries with strong public service, suggests that the opportunity structures for selectivity based on political interest are great across media environments, but more narrow when it comes to ideological selectivity in European countries. Therefore, to understand the role of selective exposure, it is essential to broaden research to include European countries with different opportunity structures for selective exposure than the US. One such country is Sweden, a typical example of what Hallin and

Mancini (2004) has identified as the democratic corporatist model of media and politics. Other countries belonging to this model are, for example, Austria, Germany and the other Nordic countries.

Selective Exposure Opportunities in the Swedish Broadcasting System

In this study we will focus on selective exposure with respect to television. As mentioned earlier, one key reason is that television remains one of the most important sources of information for most people. As a typical democratic corporatist country, the Swedish broadcasting system is dominated by two public service channels (SVT1 and SVT2) and one commercial broadcaster (TV4). TV4 is also restricted by some public service obligations. Although there is a commercial cable television market, in terms of news and current affairs SVT1, SVT2 and TV4 dominate and attract broad segments of the population (Ohlsson 2015). Together these three channels provide a rich opportunity structure for political information.

In contrast to the US, there are no partisan television channels in Sweden. Thus, it makes little sense to study ideological divides in the audience of different television channels. The lack of partisan channels does not, however, prevent programming that is partisan in nature. One prime example is the institutionalized party-leader interviews that are televised prior to each national election in Sweden. In this study, and inspired by Stroud's (2011) study on Democratic and Republican presidential nomination acceptance speeches, we thus focus on exposure to these party-leader interviews. In arguing why she studies exposure to presidential nomination acceptance speeches, Stroud stresses the popularity and the blatant partisanship of the speeches as reasons to expect ideological selective exposure (2011: 42). In comparative terms, the televised party-leader interviews in Sweden are equivalent to the acceptance speeches in terms of

being central to Swedish national election campaigns and reaching wide audiences (Esaiasson and Håkansson, 2013; Shehata & Strömbäck, 2013). Moreover, they are equivalent in the sense that a television viewer can easily anticipate each interview to be either attitude-consistent or attitude-discrepant.

The party-leader interviews are broadcasted live during the final weeks of the Swedish election campaign. A pair of experienced professional journalists interviews each leader of the parties having seats in parliament for a full hour. The interviews are broadcasted live on prime time by one of the public service television channels, thereby providing a unique opportunity for parties to get their message across unedited and without having to face political opponents. Furthermore, since people know which party leader is being interviewed, they have every chance to select or avoid these interviews based on their political interest or ideological preferences.

With respect to the Swedish political system, it is essential to know that Sweden had seven parties in parliament at the time, but also that these parties formed two blocs, one center-left and one center-right. In the election, the parties in the center-right bloc – who had been in government since 2006 – won about 49 percent of the votes while the center-left bloc won about 44 percent of the votes. An eighth party – the Sweden Democrats – also entered parliament after having received 5.7 percent of the votes.

Hypotheses: The Role of General Political Interest and Ideological Preferences

Turning to our hypotheses, and based on the notion of different opportunity structures for selective exposure, our basic argument is that *the Swedish broadcasting system provides more choice opportunities at the genre level than at the ideological level*. As a consequence, we expect

that *political interest will be more important than ideological leaning in explaining exposure to party-leader interviews*. Viewing decisions at the genre level refer to choices between watching news and current affairs, entertainment, sports, movies, sitcoms, etc., while choices at the ideological level refer to the political leaning of a television program or channel (liberal, conservative, right-wing or left-wing, etc.) (Webster 2014).

With respect to party-leader interviews, people with divergent political beliefs have the chance to either actively change channel or turn the television off to avoid these interviews, while citizens who share the political views of a particular party can tune-in. Following Stroud's findings concerning ideological selective exposure to presidential acceptance speeches, we should expect some ideologically driven selective exposure to the party-leader interviews in Sweden as well. However, previous research suggests that television viewing is driven at least as much by habits and routines as by personal preferences (Diddi and LaRose 2006; LaRose 2010; Rosenstein and Grant 1997; Webster 2014; Wonneberger et al. 2011). Following Mutz and Young (2011), ideological selective exposure should thus be affected by habitual television viewing or channel loyalty. In a polarized broadcasting system like the American, the opportunity structure enables citizens to develop viewing habits based on ideological preferences, resulting in what Mutz and Young term passive selective exposure. In contrast, the substantial audience share for public service broadcasting in Sweden means that a significant part of the habitual television viewing will take place on the main public service channels (Aalberg and Curran 2012; Shehata et al. 2015). Thus, the lack of opportunities for ideological selective exposure at the channel level combined with the importance of viewing habits can be expected to reduce ideological selective exposure to specific political content.

Despite this, we still expect to find some ideological selective exposure to the party-leader interviews. The *main gap* in exposure to Swedish party leader interviews, we argue, is however not between citizens with different ideological leanings but between people with an ideological preference – either left-leaning or right-leaning – and those without. This argument is based on two propositions. First, on the individual level, previous studies indicate that people with ideological preferences are generally more politically active, interested, and knowledgeable than people who are neither left- nor right-leaning (Curran et al. 2012; Oscarsson and Holmberg 2008). Therefore, they are also more likely to watch the party-leader interviews. Second, while the Swedish broadcasting system provides limited opportunities to select television channels based on ideological orientations, there are a large number of national and international cable channels that broadcast entertainment, movies or television shows rather than politics and current affairs. This makes it significantly easier to select media content based on general interest in politics than on ideological preferences. Thus, while there are ample opportunities to seek-out non-political television programs for those uninterested in politics, people who are equally interested in politics but divided ideologically are dependent on the same channels for getting televised campaign information.

In this context it is important to note that selecting information in line with one's attitudes does not necessarily imply avoidance of attitude-discrepant information. In fact, people have several reasons to expose themselves to attitude-discrepant information: it can be emotionally rewarding to argue against such information and reject it; such information can help people prepare a defense for their own position; or it could be useful to learn about attitude-discrepant information to reexamine one's own position (Garrett et al. 2013; Knobloch-Westerwick 2015). However, it requires a certain degree of political interest to engage in such cognitive demanding

activities. Consequentially, those politically interested are more prone to embrace both attitude-discrepant as well as attitude-consistent information, and this general motivation is likely to be stronger among people with an ideological leaning than among those without.

Based on these arguments we expect to find some ideological selective exposure to the party-leader interviews in Sweden, but also that political interest is more important than ideological leanings in explaining why people watch interviews. Our hypotheses thus are:

H1a: People with a right-leaning ideology are more likely to watch party-leader interviews with right-wing parties, while people with a left-leaning ideology are more likely to watch party leader-interviews with left-wing parties.

H1b: People with an ideological leaning are more likely than those who are neither left- nor right-leaning to watch party-leader interviews, independently of the direction of their ideological leanings.

H1c: General political interest is more important than ideological preferences for explaining why people watch party leader-interviews.

To extend our analysis and assess the robustness of our findings we will also test our hypotheses in relation to partisan learning. If increased media supply results in less cross-cutting media exposure it could lead to low awareness of attitude-inconsistent information, compared to the awareness of attitude-consistent information. Thus, by partisan learning, we refer to *one-sided* campaign learning, that is, learning about the proposals of parties with whom voters agree ideologically. Partisan learning should thereby be contrasted to general campaign learning, which reflects learning about parties from all political camps.

Intuitively it would make sense that people remember information with which they agree better than information with which they disagree. However, this seems not to be the case (Eagly et al. 1999). The tendency to counter-argue attitude-discrepant messages is part of the mechanism that makes counter-attitudinal messages as memorable as pro-attitudinal messages (Eagly et al. 2000). A similar point is made by Taber & Lodge (2006), who show that people engage more in denigrating arguments they disagree with than bolster arguments they agree with. Doing so requires a certain level of motivation and political interest however. Therefore, we expect to find a similar pattern for partisan learning as for exposure to party-leader interviews.

H2a: People with a right-leaning ideology are more likely to learn about the proposals of right-wing parties, while people with a left-leaning ideology are more likely to learn about the proposals of left-wing parties, during the election campaign.

H2b: People with an ideological leaning are more likely than those who are neither left- nor right-leaning to learn about the proposals of all political parties, independently of the direction of their ideological leaning.

H2c: General political interest is more important than ideological preferences for campaign learning.

Data and Methodology

To investigate the hypotheses above we will rely on a four-wave panel study conducted during the 2010 Swedish national election campaign. Compared to cross-sectional surveys, using panel data provides the opportunity to study how ideological preferences and motivations formed already prior to the election campaign influence information selectivity during the campaign, i.e.,

whether citizens with certain ideological orientations measured months before election day are more or less likely to subsequently expose themselves to attitude-consistent and inconsistent media content. Thus, by analyzing these dynamics over time, the panel design provides substantially better opportunities to capture the causal effect of ideological preferences on selectivity and retention (Finkel 1995). The panel survey was conducted by [blinded] in cooperation with the polling institute [blinded] in Sweden.

The sample was drawn using stratified probability sampling from a database of approximately 28,000 citizens from [blinded's] pool of Web survey participants. Those included in this pool are recruited continuously using both random digit dialing and mail surveys based on random probability samples. Approximately five percent of those who are initially contacted and invited agree to be part of this pool of respondents. The pool of Web survey participants covers different segments of the population in terms of e.g. residence, age, education and occupation.

The probability sample of 4,760 respondents aged 18-74 from this pool was stratified by gender, age, county size, political interest and Internet use, so as to be as representative of the Swedish population aged 18-74 years as possible. Among these, we base our analyses on those 4010 respondents who were invited to participate in all waves of the panel. These respondents were asked to complete a Web-based survey at four times during a period of five months leading up to the election. Wave 1 of the panel took place in May (May 3-May 20), wave 2 in mid-June (June 14-June 23), wave 3 in mid-August (August 16-23), and finally, wave 4 immediately after Election Day (September 20-September 27). The total cooperation rates were 63 % in wave 1, 48 % in wave 2, 43 % in wave 3 and 39 % in wave 4. However, not everyone participated in all waves, but a total number of 1,413 respondents did so – amounting to a 35 % of all respondents initially contacted. While the overall response rates are relatively high given common problems

of panel attrition, the sampling procedure and final cooperation rates certainly raise issues concerning external validity. Compared to available population statistics, the final sample is broadly representative with regard to sex, age and geography (county size), but weaker in terms of education (47% with higher education in the sample, compared to 29% among the population). Compared to cross-sectional surveys based on traditional national probability samples, the panel respondents are also more interested in politics (63% compared to 52%) and more frequent users of the Internet (92% compared to 78%). Although the primary strength with panel data is the opportunity to analyze changes in communication and opinions over time – and more specifically, to use measures of personal motivations (interest and ideological leaning) collected prior to the campaign as predictors of viewing behaviors during the campaign, we will therefore base descriptive statistics on weighted data.

Measures

Our key variables in the present study are ideological orientation, ideological selective exposure and partisan learning. While ideological orientation was measured in the first panel wave, both selective exposure and learning were tapped in the following waves – wave 2, 3 and 4. In addition, we use several control variables to identify the unique effect of ideological orientation on ideological exposure and partisan learning.

Ideological orientation was measured in prior to the election campaign based on a standard left-right ideological scale. Respondents were asked to identify their orientation on an 11-point scale from 0 (“Clearly to the left”) to 10 (“Clearly to the right”). A three-level categorical variable was created by distinguishing respondents with a left-leaning orientation (0-4 on the original 11-point scale), from those lacking a clear ideological orientation (5 on the

original 11-point scale), as well as respondents with a right-leaning orientation (6-10 on the original 11-point scale) – creating three groups of left-leaning (n=1000), centre (n=566) and right-leaning (n=1135) citizens.

As discussed above the presence of selective exposure will be analyzed in relation to televised party-leader interviews. *Exposure to party-leader interviews* broadcasted on the main public service channels in the final weeks of the election campaign was measured in the fourth panel wave, based on a battery of survey items asking whether respondents watched each of the seven one-hour-long party-leader interviews. For each party-leader interview, the response categories ranged from 0 (No) to 1 (Yes, partly) and 2 (Yes, the entire interview). Apart from analyzing each of these items separately, we also computed two additive scales: (1) exposure to left-wing party-leader interviews (range 0-6, mean value=1.95, standard deviation=1.98) and (2) exposure to right-wing party-leader interviews (range 0-8, mean value=2.34, standard deviation=2.53).

To measure *learning* during the campaign, the panel survey included several items tapping campaign knowledge, i.e., awareness of events taking place and policy proposals presented during the election campaign – measured in wave 2, 3 and 4. In order to capture potential partisan learning, we focus here on knowledge about specific policy proposals presented by the parties during the campaign. For instance, respondents were asked questions like: “Which of the following proposals were presented by the left-wing parties in their joint party manifesto?”. Five response categories, including “Don’t Know”, were given for each knowledge question in order to minimize the chance of randomly guessing the correct answer. A time limit of twenty seconds for answering each question was used to avoid Web searches for the correct answers. For each knowledge question respondents who gave a correct answer were

given the value 1, while incorrect and don't know answers were coded 0. We identified nine items focusing on knowledge about the left-wing parties, and six items about the right-wing parties – creating two separate learning scales ranging from 0-9 (left-wing party learning) and 0-5 (right-wing party learning). Based these items, we constructed a (1) left-wing party knowledge index (range 0-9, mean value=3.47, standard deviation=2.11) as well as a (2) right-wing party knowledge index (range 0-5, mean value=2.55, standard deviation=1.28).

In addition to these focal variables, the panel survey also included a number of key control variables such as age, gender, education and income. Most importantly however, given our focus on more political motivations and resources, the analyses will account for individual differences in political interest and general political knowledge. *Political interest* was measured in the first panel wave (t-4) based on two four-level items focusing on respondents' interest in (1) politics as well as in (2) the election campaign (pearson's $r=0.73$). The two items were summed to form a political interest index ranging from 0 (no interest) to 6 (strong interest). *General political knowledge* – representing the stock of political knowledge that citizens brought with them at the beginning of the election campaign – was also measured in wave 1 (t-4). This is an additive index based on eight political knowledge questions focused on personalities (three items), political processes (three items), and issue positions (two items) – with acceptable reliability levels (Kuder-Richardsson=0.72).

Results

Table 1 presents some basic descriptive statistics covering initial differences between left-leaning, centre and right-leaning voters at the beginning of the election campaign. As can be seen, there are no major differences with respect to age between these groups, indicating that

fundamental political orientations do not follow an age pattern. This is not the case for political motivation and resource variables, however. While right-leaning citizens score slightly higher than left-leaners on both news attention and general political knowledge, their interest in politics is fairly equal. The major gap, however, is found between people who are neither right- nor left-leaning and those who are either right- or left-leaning. Citizens lacking an ideological leaning are substantively less interested in politics, pay less attention to political news in traditional media, and score significantly lower on political knowledge, than do both left-wing and right-wing citizens.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Ideological Selective Exposure

The research question at heart of this study concerns selective exposure, i.e. the extent to which left-right orientations as well as general political interest influence (1) what media content citizens turn to as well as (2) what political information they acquire during the election campaign. We start confronting the exposure dimension in figure 1, which displays the relationship between left-right orientations and exposure to televised party leader interviews. As can be seen, there is a consistent relationship between ideological orientations expressed prior to the campaign, and exposure to televised party-leader interviews in the final weeks of the election campaign. Citizens considering themselves as left-leaning are more likely to watch interviews with party-leaders representing the left-wing parties – the Left Party, the Social Democrats and the Green Party – than right-leaning citizens are. The gap amounts to approximately 6-12 percentage points between the two ideological camps. A similar pattern is found for exposure to

right-wing party-leader interviews. These are primarily watched by citizens with a right-leaning orientation, and this time the left-right gap amounts to approximately 6-15 percentage points.

Furthermore, there is another striking pattern in figure 1: those who watch party-leader interviews to the least extent are citizens lacking a clear political left-right orientation, suggesting again that the primary gap in political information exposure is not due to ideological but to more general motivation factors. It is not the ideological divide that matters, but rather whether citizens possess ideological convictions or not, which is likely to be related to differences in interest, attention and general knowledge as documented above.

FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

So far, the results presented have been descriptive – revealing a consistent pattern of ideological selective exposure to televised interviews. However, even though the findings indicate that ideological orientations are related to *what* partisan content citizens are exposed to – and that citizens seem to prefer attitude-consistent information – additional individual-level analyses suggests that these types of media use are far from ideologically divided. The bivariate correlation between watching party-leader interviews of the left-wing parties on the one hand, and of the right-wing parties on the other hand, is very strong (pearson's $r=.80$). This again suggests that general political motivations – or viewing habits – rather than ideological motivations drive television exposure during the election campaign.

In table 2 we present a more critical test of the ideological selective exposure hypothesis by analyzing whether there are independent effects of left-right orientations on television

exposure, controlling for a host of socioeconomic background, political resource (knowledge) and motivation (interest) variables. Here we use left-leaning respondents as the reference group when estimating the effect of ideological orientation. Furthermore, we introduce general political interest and knowledge variables sequentially in the analysis.¹

The patterns unraveled in table 2 are revealing. First, model 1 includes ideological orientation and background variables only, and the results confirm previous bivariate findings indicating the presence of ideological selectivity. They also indicate that voters who are neither left- nor right-leaning are the least exposed to televised interviews irrespective of who is interviewed. Second, however, this “curvilinear” pattern disappears when political interest and knowledge are added to the regression in model 2. Once these variables are added, ideological orientation has a more linear impact on exposure to party leader interviews: both centre ($b = -.28$, $p < .05$) and right-leaning ($b = -.42$, $p < .001$) voters are significantly less likely to watch interviews with left-wing party leaders, while centre ($b = .55$, $p < .01$) and right-leaning ($b = .99$, $p < .001$) voters are more likely to watch interviews with right-wing leaders – compared to citizens with a left-leaning ideological orientation. It is also evident that political interest has a much stronger and consistent effect on watching party leader interviews than general political knowledge. Together these two variables increase the amount of explained variance by approximately 15-18 percentage points (adjusted R^2 increases from 12% to 27% and from 10% to 28% when these variables are added).

The importance of political interest as a predictor of exposure to party-leader interviews compared to ideological orientation can be further tested in two ways. First, what is the relative importance of each variable in terms of overall contribution to the model? By comparing the

¹ Given the character of our dependent variables, we also estimated all models using ordered logit regression. The substantive results were however very similar in terms of effects and statistical significance.

change in R-square when both variables are excluded from the full model (model 2), one at a time, their individual contribution can be assessed. Dropping ideological orientation (the two dummy variables) from model 2, yields a decrease in adjusted R-square of approximately 1-3 percentage points. Excluding political interest, on the other hand, results in a drop in adjusted R-square of approximately 12-13 percentage points. Second, what is the substantive effect on exposure to party-leader interviews resulting from a change in ideological orientation as well as in political interest? One way to assess this is to look at the maximum possible effects. For instance, citizens with a right-leaning ideological orientation score, on average, 0.42 points lower on the exposure to left-wing party-leader interviews scale compared to left-wing voters, while the maximum effect of political interest is 3.42 on the exposure scale (6×0.57). Similarly, while having a right-wing leaning increases exposure to right-wing party-leader interviews by 0.99, the maximum effect of interest is 4.32 on the exposure scale (6×0.72). Although such comparisons are not straightforward, they illustrate the relative importance of general political interest as a motivation behind party-leader interviews.²

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Partisan Learning

As discussed above, one of the key concerns frequently raised is that growing opportunities for media choice will not only elevate the impact of personal motivations and preferences on what media content citizens are exposed to, but also what information they acquire. In terms of ideological selectivity, growing supply is assumed to result in less cross-cutting media exposure and, thereby, decreasing awareness of attitude-inconsistent information. Above we found that

² For instance, while our political interest measure is a continuous scale capturing the strength of this motivation, ideological orientation is a categorical variable that does not take ideological strength into account. Thus, going from a minimum to a maximum value on these two measures has different implications substantively.

while ideological selective exposure does occur, citizens who are exposed to partisan media content about parties with their preferred ideological leaning are also likely to be exposed to information about the non-preferred parties. Thus, in this regard a more general political motivation seems to be what distinguishes people who in terms of ideology are neither right- nor left- leaning and those who are either right- or left-leaning.

The question is whether the same pattern can be found with respect to partisan learning, i.e., the extent to which citizens primarily learn about the policies and proposals of their own favored parties during the campaign. Figure 2 gives a first glimpse at this issue by illustrating partisan learning among citizens based on their left-right orientations. The findings reveal very little evidence of extensive partisan learning. While right-leaning citizens are slightly more likely to learn about the activities of the right-wing parties, they are also more likely to learn about the left-wing parties than left-leaning voters are. Again however, the most striking learning gap is not found between partisans of different ideological camps, but between people with no clear ideological leaning and those who are either right- or left-leaning. Citizens lacking a clear left-right orientation score lowest on both left-wing party knowledge (21 percent correct answers) and right-wing party knowledge (36 percent correct), compared to the left-leaning (31 and 47 percent) and right-leaning (38 and 51 percent correct) voters respectively.

FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

In table 3 we conduct a more critical test of the partisan learning hypothesis based on a series of regressions models predicting both left-wing and right-wing partisan learning. For both types of

learning, two models are estimated in order to see how general political knowledge and interest influence the effect of ideological orientations on learning. Focusing on left-wing partisan learning, model 1 confirms the findings displayed in figure 2, even when controlling for several background characteristics: Compared to citizens who are neither right- nor left-leaning (the reference category), both left-wing and right-wing citizens learn significantly more about the activities of the left-wing parties during the campaign. Once we include political interest and general political knowledge, however (model 2), this effect of ideological orientation is substantially reduced, while the important role of general motivations and knowledge is reflected both in their highly significant coefficients as well as the dramatic increase in R-squared when these variables are included (from .19 to .46). A very similar pattern is found for right-wing party knowledge. People who are neither left- nor right-leaning learn significantly less than people with an ideological leaning, irrespective of direction. But once interest and general political knowledge are included, these effects disappear.

TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

Conclusions and Discussion

While most research on selective exposure has focused on the US, in this study we extended research to a country that in many respects differ significantly from the US in terms of the opportunity structures for selective exposure. This, we argue, is important since there is ample evidence that media use is influenced by media environments as well as by individual-level variables (Aalberg et al. 2013, Althaus et al. 2009; Curran et al. 2009; Goldman and Mutz 2011; Shehata and Strömbäck, 2011). Because the Swedish broadcasting system provides better opportunity structures at the genre level than at the ideological level, our expectation was that

political interest would be more important than ideological leanings in explaining exposure to televised party interviews, without eradicating the importance of ideological leanings.

To briefly summarize, the results show support for several of our hypotheses. First, people with a right-leaning ideology were more likely to watch party leader-interviews with right-wing parties, while people with a left-leaning ideology were more likely to watch party leader-interviews with left-wing parties (H1a). These ideological selectivity effects – showing that citizens are more likely to seek-out attitude-consistent than attitude-discrepant information – held up even when controlling for a range of background, political motivation and resource factors. Second, however, the results indicate that basic political interest is substantially more important than ideological leaning in explaining why people watch party-leader interviews (H1c). Thus, rather than being driven by ideological preferences, exposure to party-leader interviews is primarily dependent on other types of motivations, that differentiates people who are neither right- nor left-leaning from those who are either right- or left-leaning (H1b).

According to the data presented here and elsewhere (Oscarsson and Holmberg 2008), people lacking an ideological orientation are less interested in politics, pay less attention to politics in traditional news media, and are less knowledgeable about politics. Finally, these patterns were also replicated using partisan learning instead of exposure as the dependent variable. That is, we found very little evidence of partisan learning occurring at all (H2a). Instead, gaps in learning emerged between people who are neither right- nor left-leaning and those who are either right- or left-leaning and these gaps disappeared when accounting for political interest and general political knowledge (H2b and H2c).

Beyond these empirical findings, the main theoretical contribution of this study relates to the notion of opportunity structures for selective exposure. Defined as the availability of different

media, media formats, media genres and media content and the ease to which citizens can select media and media content based on their personal preferences, the concept of opportunity structures for selective exposure has several implications for theory and research on selective exposure. First, it is a reminder that empirical findings of selective exposure from any particular media environment and country, with its specific opportunity structure for selective exposure, cannot be transferred to media environments and countries with other opportunity structures for selective exposure. Second, it highlights and offers a framework for further research on how opportunities – a macro-level variable – influence and moderate the importance of individual preferences and abilities – micro-level variables. As part of this, it highlights the importance of distinguishing between different forms of selectivity in terms of what the opportunity structures look like and in terms of its presence and ubiquity. Third and related, it offers a framework for studies investigating differences in opportunity structures for selective exposure across different countries, media environments, media types and genres. With increasing media supply follows increasing selectivity, and media environments across democracies have all transformed from low- to high-choice media environments. However, the antecedents as well as the prevalence and consequences of selectivity might vary depending on the opportunity structures for different forms of selectivity. Fourth and related to the findings of this study, it suggests that media policy and policies aimed at strengthening public service broadcasting might offer a means towards counteracting selective exposure based on political or ideological preferences. This, of course, assumes that limited opportunity structures for selectivity with respect to broadcasting does not create incentives for those with strong preferences to migrate to other media where the opportunity structures are more conducive to selectivity based on political or ideological preferences or on political interest. This highlights the importance of understanding how

different opportunity structures for selectivity with respect to different media are linked to each other and people's media use.

As this study is a single-country study, a key question though is how far the results can be generalized. While ultimately an empirical question, based on our reasoning above our best estimate is that the findings can be generalized to countries with similar opportunity structures for selective exposure. What matters is not the country per se, but the opportunity structures for different types of selective exposure. Concerning more everyday coverage of political affairs, this also means that it is likely the case that *ideological selective exposure* to television is even more limited than suggested by the results in this study, as there is usually less partisan programming on television than during election campaigns. This should however not limit selective exposure based on political interest. Again, the key is the opportunity structures for different forms of selective exposure.

In essence, if we want to understand selective exposure across contemporary media environments and countries, we must understand the different opportunity structures for different types of selective exposure. We cannot think of or study selective exposure as a matter of individual preferences and traits only.

Funding: This research was partly funded by the research project "Changing Media Environments, Changing Democracies", supported by the Axel and Margaret Ax:son Johnson Foundation.

References

- Aalberg, Toril, and James Curran (eds.). 2012. *How Media Inform Democracy. A Comparative Approach*. London: Routledge.
- Aalberg, Toril., Arild Blekesaune, and Eiri Elvestad. 2013. "Media choice and informed democracy. Towards increasing news consumption gaps in Europe?" *International Journal of Press/Politics*. 18 (3): 281-303. doi: 10.1177/1940161213485990
- Arceneaux, Kevin, and Martin Johnson. 2013. *Changing Minds or Changing Channels? Partisan News in an Age of Choice*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Althaus, Scott. L., Anne. M. Cizmar, and James G. Gimpel. 2009. "Media supply, audience demand, and the geography of news consumption in the United States." *Political Communication* 26(3): 249–277. doi: 10.1080/10584600903053361.
- Bennett, W. Lance and Shanto Iyengar. 2008. "A new era of minimal effects? The changing foundations of political communication." *Journal of Communication* 58(1), pp. 707–731. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00410.x.
- Curran, James, Shanto Iyengar, Anker B. Lund, & Inka Salovara-Moring. 2009. "Media system, public knowledge and democracy: A comparative study." *European Journal of Communication* 24(5): 5–26. doi: 10.1177/0267323108098943.
- Curran, James, Sharon Coen, Toril Aalberg, Shanto Iyengar. 2012. "News Content, Media Consumption, and Current Affairs Knowledge." In *How Media Inform Democracy. A Comparative Approach*, eds. Toril Aalberg, and James Curran. New York: Routledge, pp. 81-97.

- Delli Carpini, Michael. X, Fay L. Cook, and Lawrence R. Jacobs. 2004. "Public deliberation, discursive participation, and citizen engagement: a review of the empirical literature." *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7: 315–344. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.7.121003.091630.
- Didi, Arvind, and Robert LaRose, R. 2006. "Getting Hooked on News: Uses and Gratifications and the Formation of News Habits Among College Students in an Internet Environment." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 50(2), 193-210. doi: 10.1207/s15506878jobem5002_2.
- Eagly, Alice. H., Serena Chen, Shelly Chaiken, and Kelly Shaw-Barnes. 1999. "The impact of attitudes on memory: An affair to remember." *Psychological Bulletin*, 125: 64-89. doi: 10.1037/0033- 2909.125.1.64.
- Eagly, Alice. H., Patrick Kuelsa, Laura A. Brannon, Kelly Shaw, and Sarah Hutson-Comeaux. 2000. "Why Counterattitudinal Messages Are as Memorable as Proattitudinal Messages: The Importance of Active Defense Against Attack." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 26: 1392-1408. doi: 10.1177/0146167292186002.
- Esaiasson, Peter, and Nicklas Håkansson. 2013. "Enter the Professionals. Shifting Logics of Election Broadcasts in Sweden." In *A History of Swedish Broadcasting. Communicative Ethos, Genres and Institutional Change*, eds. Monika Djerf-Pierre, and Mats Ekström. Göteborg: Nordicom, pp. 195-217.
- Esser, Frank, Claes De Vreese, Jesper Strömbäck, Peter van Aelst, Toril Aalberg, James Stanyer, Günther Lengauer et al. 2012. "Political Information Opportunities in Europe: A Longitudinal and Comparative Study of Thirteen Television Systems." *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 17(3): 247–274. doi: 10.1177/1940161212442956.

- Finkel, Steven. 1995. *Causal Analysis With Panel Data*. Sage: Thousand Oaks.
- Frey, Dieter. 1986. "Recent Research on Selective Exposure to Information." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19: 41–80.
- Garrett, R. Kelly, Dustin Carnahan, and Emily K. Lynch. 2013. "A turn toward avoidance? Selective exposure to online political information, 2004–2008." *Political Behavior* 35(1): 113–134. doi: 10.1007/s11109-011-9185-6.
- Goldman, Seth K. & Diana C. Mutz. 2011. "The Friendly Media Phenomenon: A Cross-National Analysis of Cross-Cutting Exposure." *Political Communication* 28(1): 42-66. doi: 10.1080/10584609.2010.544280.
- Hallin, Daniel. C, and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Iyengar Shanto, and Kyu S. Hahn. 2009. "Red Media, Blue Media: Evidence of Ideological Selectivity in Media Use." *Journal of Communication* 59(1): 19-39. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01402.x.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, Silvia and Jingbo Meng. 2009. "Looking the other way: Selective exposure to attitude-consistent and counter-attitudinal political information." *Communication Research* 36(3), 426–448. doi: 10.1177/0093650209333030.
- Ksiazek, Thomas B., Edward C. Malthouse, and James G. Webster. 2010. "News-seekers and news-avoiders: Exploring patterns of total news consumption across media and the relationship to civic participation." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 54(4): 551-568. doi: 10.1080/08838151.2010.519808.

- LaRose, Robert. 2010. "The Problem of Media Habits." *Communication Theory*, 20(2), 194-222.
doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01360.x.
- Lodge, Milton and Charles S. Taber. 2013. *The Rationalizing Voter*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Luskin, Robert C. 1990. "Explaining political sophistication." *Political Behavior* 12(4), pp. 331–361. doi: 10.1007/BF00992793
- Mutz, Diana C., and Paul S. Martin. 2001. "Facilitating Communication across Lines of Political Difference: The Role of Mass Media." *American Political Science Review* 95(1): 97-114.
- Mutz, Diana C. 2006. *Hearing the other side: Deliberative versus participatory democracy*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mutz, Diana C., and Lori Young. 2011. "Communication and Public Opinion. Plus Ça Change?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 75(5): 1018-1044. doi: 10.1093/poq/nfr052.
- Ohlsson, Jonas. 2015. "Nyhetskonsumtionens mekanismer." In *Fragment*, eds Annika Bergström, Bengt Johansson, Henrik Oscarsson and Maria Oskarson. Göteborg: SOM-institutet, pp. 435–450.
- Oscarsson, Henrik, and Sören Holmberg. 2008. *Regeringsskifte: Väljarna och valet 2006*. Stockholm: Norstedts Juridik.
- Petersson, Olof, Sören Holmberg, Monika Djerf-Pierre, Jesper Strömbäck, and Lennart Weibull. 2006. *Media and Elections in Sweden*. Stockholm: SNS Förlag.

- Pew Research Center for the People & the Press. 2010. "Americans Spending More Time Following the News—Ideological News Sources: Who Watches and Why." <http://people-press.org/files/legacy-pdf/652.pdf> (accessed July 31, 2014).
- Prior, Markus. 2007. *Post-Broadcast Democracy. How Media Choice Increases Inequality in Political Involvement and Polarizes Elections*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenstein, Aviva. W., and August E. Grant. 1997. "Reconceptualizing the Role of Habits: A New Model of Television Audience Activity." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 41(3), 324-344. doi: 10.1080/08838159709364411.
- Shehata, Adam, and Jesper Strömbäck. 2011. "A matter of context: A comparative study of media environments and news consumption gaps in Europe." *Political Communication*, 28(1): 110–134. DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2010.543006.
- Stroud, Natalie J. 2008. "Media use and political predispositions: Revisiting the concept of selective exposure." *Political Behavior*, 30(3): 341–366. doi: 10.1007/s11109-007-9050-9.
- Stroud, Natalie J. 2010. "Polarization and Partisan Selective Exposure." *Journal of Communication* 60(3): 556-576. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2010.01497.x.
- Stroud, Natalie. J. 2011. *Niche News: The Politics of News Choice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sunstein, Cass R. 2007. *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Strömbäck, Jesper, and Adam Shehata. 2010. "Media malaise or a virtuous circle? Exploring the causal relationships between news media exposure, political news attention and political

interest.” *European Journal of Political Research* 49(5): 575–597. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6765.2009.01913.x.

Strömbäck, Jesper, and Adam Shehata. 2013. “Kampanjeffekter under svenska valrörelser.” In *Kampen om opinionen. Politisk kommunikation under svenska valrörelser*, eds Jesper Strömbäck and Lars Nord. Stockholm: SNS Förlag, pp. 207–238.

Strömbäck, Jseper, Monika Djerf-Pierre, and Adam Shehata. 2013. “The Dynamics of Political Interest and News Media Consumption: A Longitudinal Perspective.” *International journal of Public Opinion Research* 25(4): 414–435. doi: 10.1093/ijpor/eds018.

Taber, Charles S., and Milton Lodge. 2006. “Motivated Skepticism in the Evaluation of Political Beliefs.” *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(3): 755–769. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00214.x

Wonneberger, Anke, Klaus Schoenbach, and Lex van Meurs. 2011. “Interest in news and politics – or situational determinants? Why People Watch the News.” *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 55(3): 325–343. doi: 10.1080/08838151.2011.597466.

Tables

Table 1. Descriptive differences between left-wing, centre and right-wing citizens (mean values).

	Age (years)	Political Interest (0-6)	News Attention (0-12)	Political Knowledge (0-8)
Left (n=819)	48	3.74	6.05	5.21
Centre (n=461)	48	2.76	4.48	4.05
Right (n=991)	51	3.75	6.34	5.48

Note: The reported number of observations represents the minimum number of cases for each row.

Table 2. The effects of ideological orientation on exposure to party leader interviews (ols).

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Ideological Orientation				
Centre	-.79*** (.12)	-.28* (.13)	-.14 (.15)	.55** (.16)
Right-leaning	-.47*** (.10)	-.42*** (.10)	.88*** (.13)	.99*** (.13)
Political interest	-	.57*** (.03)	-	.72*** (.04)
Political knowledge	-	.06* (.03)	-	.05 (.04)
High School	.05 (.15)	-.15 (.16)	.11 (.19)	-.26 (.20)
University	.18 (.15)	-.21 (.16)	.24 (.19)	-.32 (.21)
Income	-.04 (.03)	-.06* (.03)	-.08 (.04)	-.11** (.04)
Man	.04 (.09)	-.20* (.09)	.13 (.12)	-.17 (.12)
Age	.04*** (.00)	.02*** (.00)	.05*** (.00)	.03*** (.00)
Adjusted R ²	.10	.27	.12	.28
N	1864	1573	1864	1573

Estimates are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.

Table 3. The effects of left-right orientation on partisan learning (ols).


	Left-wing Party Knowledge		Right-wing Party Knowledge	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Ideological orientation				
Left-wing	.84*** (.16)	-.03 (.15)	.47*** (.09)	.07 (.10)
Right-wing	1.25*** (.16)	.29* (.15)	.43*** (.09)	.05 (.09)
Political interest	-	.45*** (.04)	-	.19*** (.03)
Political knowledge	-	.45*** (.03)	-	.21*** (.02)
High School	.41* (.20)	.15 (.20)	.19 (.11)	.05 (.12)
University	.89*** (.20)	.20 (.20)	.46*** (.11)	.09 (.13)
Income	.06 (.04)	.03 (.03)	.06** (.02)	.04 (.02)
Man	.82*** (.12)	.30** (.11)	.32*** (.07)	.04 (.07)
Age	.03*** (.00)	-.00 (.00)	.02*** (.00)	.01*** (.00)
Pseudo R ²	.19	.46	.16	.31
N	1084	924	1254	1057

Estimates are unstandardized coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001.


Figures

Figure 1. Exposure to televised interviews and use of party websites (percent).



Note: Total N=1864. The sample is weighted on gender, age, type of residence, education, political interest, general Internet use and voting choice in the 2006 national election.

Figure 2. Partisan learning during the election campaign (percent correct answers).



Note: Total n=1084 for estimates of left-wing party knowledge and 1254 for right-wing party knowledge. The sample is weighted on gender, age, type of residence, education, political interest, general Internet use and voting choice in the 2006 national election.